



































BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
How would you rate the overall quality of life in the Boulder Valley, taking all things into consideration?	Very good	52%	49%		-4%
	Good	42%	44%		2%
	Neither good nor bad	4%	5%		1%
	Bad	2%	1%		0%
	Very bad	0%	1%		1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	619	619		
How would you rate your familiarity with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (the Plan)?	Never heard of it/know nothing about it	10%	21%		11%
	Don't know much about it	35%	34%		-1%
	Know some things about it	39%	33%		-6%
	Know quite a bit about it	9%	8%		-2%
	Very familiar with it (e g , understand its purpose, scope, objectives, etc)	6%	5%		-1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	622	622		
How closely would you say you have been following the discussions about the Plan update now taking place?	Not at all	29%	43%		14%
	Not too closely	42%	36%		-6%
	Somewhat closely	23%	16%		-7%
	Quite closely	6%	5%		-1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	619	619		

28 Dec 16










Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Have you participated in any of the Plan update community listening sessions, meetings, surveys, or other online engagement in 2015 or 2016?	Yes, attended a neighborhood listening session or other community meeting	9%	7%		-2%
	Yes, participated in the Plan survey in fall of 2015	7%	7%		0%
	Yes, participated in other online feedback or polls	5%	5%		0%
	Yes, attended a meeting (Planning Board, City Council, etc.)	9%	8%		-1%
	No	75%	77%		1%
	Don't know/not sure	3%	4%		
TOTAL		108%	107%		
	n =	620	620		0%
Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community?	The community is generally heading in the right direction	15%	16%		1%
	The community is generally heading in the wrong direction	25%	20%		-5%
	Mixed reaction in some ways things are heading in the right direction, in other equally important ways the wrong direction	57%	58%		1%
	Don't know / no opinion	4%	7%		3%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	602	602		
Where do you live?	South Boulder	21%	19%		-2%
	North Boulder	19%	15%		-4%
	Central Boulder - North of Arapahoe	15%	19%		4%
	Southeast Boulder	13%	14%		1%
	Gunbarrel	11%	10%		-2%
	Crossroads	5%	8%		3%
	East Boulder	5%	5%		0%
	Central Boulder – University Hill (South of Arapahoe)	6%	4%		-2%
	Palo Park	3%	3%		-1%
	University of Colorado	2%	4%		2%
	Outside these areas / rural	0%	0%		0%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	606	606		

28 Dec 16
Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

CITYWIDE: Please indicate your level of support or opposition for each approach to change zoning for future commercial and industrial growth potential (not to change existing commercial and industrial spaces)		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Maintain the current policy for existing commercial and industrial growth potential for approximately 19,070 additional jobs by 2040 and potential for future total of 55,070 jobs according to zoning capacity	1=Strongly Oppose	23%	17%		-6%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	25%	23%		-2%
	3=Neutral	14%	20%		6%
	4=Somewhat Support	27%	28%		1%
	5=Strongly Support	11%	11%		1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		2.8	2.9		
n =		514	514		0%
Retain and protect service industrial (e.g. auto repair, window and glass supply, etc.) and small businesses in light industrial areas	1=Strongly Oppose	1%	1%		0%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	3%	3%		0%
	3=Neutral	10%	12%		2%
	4=Somewhat Support	35%	39%		4%
	5=Strongly Support	51%	45%		-6%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		4.3	4.2		
n =		533	533		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

CITYWIDE: Please indicate your level of support or opposition for each approach to change zoning for future commercial and industrial growth potential (not to change existing commercial and industrial spaces)		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
Reduce commercial and industrial growth potential	1=Strongly Oppose	11%	12%	1%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	23%	21%	-1%
	3=Neutral	15%	17%	2%
	4=Somewhat Support	27%	28%	1%
	5=Strongly Support	24%	21%	-3%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.3	3.2	
n =		522	522	
Reduce commercial and industrial growth potential somewhat, while also shifting potential to allow more housing	1=Strongly Oppose	13%	8%	-5%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	20%	17%	-2%
	3=Neutral	11%	12%	0%
	4=Somewhat Support	34%	38%	4%
	5=Strongly Support	23%	26%	3%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.3	3.6	
n =		515	515	
Limit the annual commercial and industrial growth potential. Adopt a non-residential "growth management system" to constrain the annual rate of commercial and industrial growth in the city	1=Strongly Oppose	12%	12%	0%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	17%	14%	-3%
	3=Neutral	10%	14%	4%
	4=Somewhat Support	25%	30%	5%
	5=Strongly Support	35%	30%	-6%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.5	3.5	
n =		523	523	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates















BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

FOR SPECIFIC AREAS (Map 2): Please indicate your level of support or opposition for each approach to change zoning for future commercial and industrial growth potential (not to change existing commercial and industrial spaces)		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
Reduce commercial growth potential in the Boulder Valley Regional Center (around 29th Street Center and 28th/30th Street corridors)	1=Strongly Oppose	12%	13%	1%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	24%	26%	2%
	3=Neutral	17%	18%	1%
	4=Somewhat Support	20%	19%	0%
	5=Strongly Support	28%	24%	-3%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.3	3.2	
n =		527	527	
Reduce commercial growth potential in Neighborhood Centers	1=Strongly Oppose	10%	12%	3%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	19%	16%	-4%
	3=Neutral	13%	13%	1%
	4=Somewhat Support	26%	31%	4%
	5=Strongly Support	31%	28%	-4%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.5	3.5	
n =		529	529	
Reduce industrial growth potential in Light Industrial areas	1=Strongly Oppose	15%	16%	1%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	31%	31%	1%
	3=Neutral	20%	21%	1%
	4=Somewhat Support	16%	16%	-1%
	5=Strongly Support	18%	16%	-2%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		2.9	2.8	
n =		527	527	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates
















BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

<i>Do you support or oppose the following approaches to building height in mixed use and non-residential areas?</i>		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Allow buildings taller than 3 stories (up to 55 feet) in additional mixed use and commercial areas, not just those shown on Map 3 above (i.e., allow limitation ordinance to expire)	1=Strongly Oppose	55%	49%		-7%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	20%	23%		3%
	3=Neutral	4%	2%		-1%
	4=Somewhat Support	9%	9%		0%
	5=Strongly Support	12%	17%		5%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		2.0	2.2		
n =		531	531		
Allow buildings taller than 3 stories (up to 55 feet) in additional mixed use and commercial areas ONLY IF certain community benefits are provided (e.g., permanently affordable housing and other benefits)	1=Strongly Oppose	45%	34%		-11%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	13%	14%		0%
	3=Neutral	7%	10%		3%
	4=Somewhat Support	22%	23%		1%
	5=Strongly Support	13%	20%		7%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		2.4	2.8		
n =		525	525		
Limit the height of buildings that are taller than 3 stories to specific mixed use and commercial areas of the city, as shown in Map 3 above (extend limitation ordinance)	1=Strongly Oppose	22%	26%		3%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	12%	12%		0%
	3=Neutral	12%	13%		1%
	4=Somewhat Support	23%	23%		0%
	5=Strongly Support	30%	26%		-4%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.3	3.1		
n =		516	516		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates










BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

What is your general level of support or opposition for new housing?		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Maintain future housing potential for approximately 6,750 new housing units in Boulder (including CU dorms)	1=Strongly Oppose	17%	14%		-3%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	18%	20%		2%
	3=Neutral	18%	19%		1%
	4=Somewhat Support	29%	25%		-3%
	5=Strongly Support	19%	21%		2%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.2	3.2		
n =		514	514		
Allow additional housing potential in Boulder (i.e. more than the 6,750 projected units)	1=Strongly Oppose	32%	25%		-7%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	16%	14%		-3%
	3=Neutral	8%	9%		1%
	4=Somewhat Support	24%	28%		4%
	5=Strongly Support	19%	24%		5%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		2.8	3.1		
n =		523	523		
Allow additional housing potential in Boulder only if a substantial amount of any future housing is permanently affordable to low and middle incomes	1=Strongly Oppose	21%	14%		-7%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	17%	13%		-4%
	3=Neutral	13%	13%		0%
	4=Somewhat Support	20%	22%		3%
	5=Strongly Support	30%	38%		8%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.2	3.6		
n =		527	527		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates











BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

HOUSING <i>What is your level of support or opposition for each approach to address future housing (including for low and middle incomes) in certain locations?</i>		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Change the Boulder Valley Regional Commercial Center (29th Street Center and 28th/30th Street corridor) land uses to allow more housing such as apartments and townhomes	1=Strongly Oppose	17%	11%		-6%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	10%	12%		2%
	3=Neutral	10%	10%		0%
	4=Somewhat Support	28%	26%		-3%
	5=Strongly Support	36%	42%		6%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.6	3.8		
n =		518	518		
Change land uses in Neighborhood Centers to allow for a variety of housing such as townhomes, rowhomes, and housing mixed with retail uses	1=Strongly Oppose	19%	13%		-6%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	9%	8%		-1%
	3=Neutral	7%	8%		1%
	4=Somewhat Support	32%	33%		1%
	5=Strongly Support	33%	37%		5%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.5	3.7		
n =		516	516		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates
















BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

HOUSING <i>What is your level of support or opposition for each approach to address future housing (including for low and middle incomes) in certain locations?</i>		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Change some of the Light Industrial Areas in Gunbarrel and East Boulder to allow more housing such as rowhomes or live-work units mixed with new local retail and amenities	1=Strongly Oppose	11%	7%		-4%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	7%	5%		-3%
	3=Neutral	7%	10%		3%
	4=Somewhat Support	34%	30%		-4%
	5=Strongly Support	41%	49%		8%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.9	4.1		
n =		517	517		
Allow options for residential infill such as accessory dwelling units and small detached homes in some single-family Residential Neighborhoods	1=Strongly Oppose	28%	19%		-9%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	12%	9%		-2%
	3=Neutral	8%	9%		1%
	4=Somewhat Support	24%	21%		-3%
	5=Strongly Support	28%	41%		13%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.1	3.6		
n =		513	513		

28 Dec 16











Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

OPTIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL INFILL		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
HOUSING OPTIONS: Either Attached or Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU - a unit located on an existing single family lot, either attached to the primary unit or detached)	1=Strongly Oppose	20%	14%		-6%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	15%	13%		-2%
	3=Neutral	11%	10%		-1%
	4=Somewhat Support	25%	22%		-3%
	5=Strongly Support	29%	40%		12%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.3	3.6		
n =		514	514		
HOUSING OPTIONS: Detached alley house or small lot detached home on an existing single family lot (a separate unit on a single lot), not increasing overall amount of square footage allowed	1=Strongly Oppose	22%	15%		-7%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	17%	15%		-3%
	3=Neutral	10%	9%		-1%
	4=Somewhat Support	25%	28%		3%
	5=Strongly Support	25%	34%		8%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.1	3.5		
n =		515	515		
HOUSING OPTIONS: Duplex or duplex conversion (a paired set of street facing units on a single lot) not increasing overall amount of square footage	1=Strongly Oppose	10%	7%		-4%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	11%	10%		-1%
	3=Neutral	13%	12%		-1%
	4=Somewhat Support	35%	34%		-1%
	5=Strongly Support	30%	37%		7%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.6	3.9		
n =		515	515		

28 Dec 16
Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

OPTIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL INFILL		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
HOUSING OPTIONS: Cottage court (a courtyard-oriented set of units, up to 2,000 sf each) This could be on a larger lot or combined lots	1=Strongly Oppose	9%	6%		-3%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	9%	9%		0%
	3=Neutral	14%	12%		-2%
	4=Somewhat Support	30%	26%		-4%
	5=Strongly Support	38%	47%		9%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.8	4.0		
n =		512	512		
HOUSING OPTIONS: Suggestions for other type(s) of infill housing (open ended)	1=Strongly Oppose	27%	16%		-11%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	7%	5%		-2%
	3=Neutral	27%	29%		2%
	4=Somewhat Support	11%	11%		0%
	5=Strongly Support	28%	39%		11%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.1	3.5		
n =		238	238		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates











BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

Do you generally support or generally oppose the idea of further limiting the size of future homes built in Boulder?		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
Limit future house sizes in Boulder, in general	1=Strongly Oppose	15%	14%	-1%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	17%	17%	0%
	3=Neutral	17%	24%	7%
	4=Somewhat Support	22%	21%	-1%
	5=Strongly Support	30%	24%	-5%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.3	3.2	
n =		511	511	
Limit future house sizes only on larger residential lots	1=Strongly Oppose	18%	13%	-5%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	23%	22%	-2%
	3=Neutral	20%	25%	4%
	4=Somewhat Support	22%	25%	3%
	5=Strongly Support	16%	16%	-1%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		3.0	3.1	
n =		499	499	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results





Do you generally support or generally oppose the idea of further limiting the size of future homes built in Boulder?		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Change regulations so that larger lots can have two or three smaller homes rather than one very large home	1=Strongly Oppose	16%	11%		-4%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	14%	13%		-1%
	3=Neutral	8%	6%		-2%
	4=Somewhat Support	31%	26%		-4%
	5=Strongly Support	31%	43%		12%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		3.5	3.8		
n =		509	509		
Pursue other strategies to address impacts on neighborhoods	1=Strongly Oppose	4%	4%		0%
	2=Somewhat Oppose	3%	1%		-1%
	3=Neutral	27%	24%		-3%
	4=Somewhat Support	24%	25%		1%
	5=Strongly Support	42%	46%		4%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
Average		4.0	4.1		
n =		357	357		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results
















OTHER POLICY CHOICES		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
What would make your neighborhood better?					
First rank	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	23%	18%	<div></div>	-5%
	More affordable housing units	8%	17%	<div></div>	9%
	Improved street maintenance	10%	7%	<div></div>	-2%
	Better transit access and frequency	6%	9%	<div></div>	3%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	8%	7%	<div></div>	-1%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	8%	5%	<div></div>	-3%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	7%	5%	<div></div>	-3%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	5%	6%	<div></div>	0%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	5%	4%	<div></div>	-1%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	4%	6%	<div></div>	2%
	Other	4%	4%	<div></div>	0%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	4%	3%	<div></div>	-1%
	Improved safety	2%	3%	<div></div>	0%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	3%	2%	<div></div>	-1%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	2%	3%	<div></div>	1%
	Improved parking access	2%	2%	<div></div>	1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	492	492		

Second rank	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	11%	9%		-2%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	6%	12%		6%
	More affordable housing units	5%	11%		6%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	9%	8%		-1%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	8%	6%		-2%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	8%	6%		-2%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	8%	7%		-1%
	Better transit access and frequency	7%	7%		-1%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	6%	7%		1%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	6%	6%		0%
	Improved street maintenance	7%	4%		-3%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	5%	5%		0%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	4%	4%		0%
	Improved parking access	3%	4%		1%
	Other	3%	2%		-1%
	Improved safety	3%	2%		-1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	463	463		
Third rank	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	12%	11%		-1%
	Improved street maintenance	9%	9%		0%
	Better transit access and frequency	9%	9%		0%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	8%	9%		1%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	6%	10%		4%
	More affordable housing units	5%	9%		5%
	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	9%	6%		-3%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	5%	9%		4%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	7%	5%		-2%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	6%	5%		-2%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	5%	5%		-1%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	5%	4%		-1%
	Improved parking access	3%	5%		2%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	4%	3%		-1%
	Improved safety	4%	2%		-1%
	Other	4%	2%		-2%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	418	418		

28 Dec 16
Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

OTHER POLICY CHOICES		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
What would make your neighborhood better?					
Fourth rank	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	7%	11%	<div></div>	4%
	Improved street maintenance	7%	10%	<div></div>	2%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	8%	8%	<div></div>	0%
	Better transit access and frequency	10%	7%	<div></div>	-3%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	7%	8%	<div></div>	0%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	7%	7%	<div></div>	0%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	7%	7%	<div></div>	1%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	7%	7%	<div></div>	1%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	8%	6%	<div></div>	-2%
	More affordable housing units	5%	8%	<div></div>	3%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	6%	5%	<div></div>	0%
	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	6%	5%	<div></div>	-1%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	5%	3%	<div></div>	-2%
	Improved parking access	3%	4%	<div></div>	0%
	Improved safety	3%	2%	<div></div>	-1%
	Other	3%	2%	<div></div>	-1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	354	354		

Fifth rank	Improved street maintenance	10%	13%		3%
	Better transit access and frequency	9%	13%		4%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	11%	10%		-1%
	Improved safety	6%	10%		4%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	8%	5%		-2%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	5%	8%		3%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	7%	5%		-2%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	6%	6%		0%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	5%	5%		-1%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	6%	4%		-2%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	5%	4%		-1%
	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	6%	4%		-2%
	Other	6%	3%		-3%
	More affordable housing units	4%	5%		2%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	5%	3%		-2%
	Improved parking access	2%	3%		1%

















TOTAL		100%	100%	
	n =	280	280	
Sixth rank	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	8%	15%	7%
	Better transit access and frequency	11%	10%	-1%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	8%	8%	0%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	7%	8%	1%
	Improved street maintenance	8%	7%	-1%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	6%	8%	2%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	8%	6%	-2%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	6%	6%	0%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	5%	6%	1%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	6%	6%	0%
	Improved safety	4%	5%	0%
	Other	5%	3%	-2%
	More affordable housing units	5%	3%	-2%
	Improved parking access	3%	4%	1%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	3%	2%	-2%
	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	3%	1%	-2%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
	n =	202	202	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

OTHER POLICY CHOICES		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
<i>What would make your neighborhood better?</i>				
Seventh rank	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	11%	12%	1%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	9%	12%	3%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	6%	12%	6%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	8%	10%	2%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	8%	9%	1%
	Improved safety	10%	7%	-3%
	Improved street maintenance	6%	7%	0%
	Better transit access and frequency	5%	6%	1%
	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	7%	5%	-3%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	6%	4%	-2%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	5%	5%	0%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	6%	3%	-2%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	4%	4%	0%
	Other	4%	2%	-2%
	Improved parking access	3%	1%	-1%
	More affordable housing units	1%	1%	0%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
	n =	154	154	

















Eighth rank	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	12%	17%		5%
	Better transit access and frequency	5%	15%		10%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	8%	11%		3%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	6%	9%		4%
	Improved safety	9%	6%		-3%
	Improved street maintenance	8%	5%		-4%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	8%	4%		-4%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	7%	4%		-3%
	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	4%	6%		2%
	More affordable housing units	6%	4%		-2%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	7%	3%		-4%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	3%	5%		2%
	Improved parking access	3%	5%		2%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	5%	3%		-2%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	4%	2%		-2%
	Other	4%	2%		-2%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	122	122		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results





OTHER POLICY CHOICES		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
What would make your neighborhood better?					
Top three neighborhood ranks combined	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	40%	32%	<div></div>	-9%
	More affordable housing units	17%	37%	<div></div>	20%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	22%	23%	<div></div>	1%
	Better transit access and frequency	20%	23%	<div></div>	3%
	Improved street maintenance	24%	19%	<div></div>	-5%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	21%	22%	<div></div>	1%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	22%	19%	<div></div>	-3%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	20%	17%	<div></div>	-4%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	12%	22%	<div></div>	9%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	18%	13%	<div></div>	-5%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	15%	16%	<div></div>	1%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	12%	10%	<div></div>	-1%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	10%	11%	<div></div>	1%
	Other	10%	7%	<div></div>	-3%
	Improved parking access	7%	10%	<div></div>	4%
Improved safety	9%	7%	<div></div>	-2%	
TOTAL		279%	287%		
	n =	492	492		

Top five neighborhood ranks combined	Preservation of existing housing and existing character	48%	38%		-10%
	Better transit access and frequency	32%	37%		5%
	Improved street maintenance	35%	34%		-1%
	More affordable housing units	22%	46%		23%
	Better sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian crossings	32%	32%		0%
	More retail (shops, dining) within a short (15-minute) walk	28%	30%		2%
	Parks, trailheads access and/or improvements	31%	27%		-4%
	Arts and culture, such as venues and performance spaces, community public art and murals	24%	33%		10%
	Addressing maintenance, noise, code enforcement	29%	24%		-5%
	Traffic calming/slowing tactics (such as speed bumps, etc.)	26%	20%		-6%
	Plan for future of nearby commercial or mixed use areas, and better transitions to residential areas of the neighborhood	22%	21%		0%
	Social structure, ability for neighbors to communicate with each other	19%	21%		2%
	Establishing a unique neighborhood identity	18%	21%		3%
	Improved safety	15%	15%		0%
	Other	16%	11%		-5%
	Improved parking access	10%	15%		5%
TOTAL		408%	426%		
	n =	492	492		

28 Dec 16























Source: RRC Associates












BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM DEVELOPMENT		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Do you think development should be granted increases in density or height, and, if so, should additional community benefits, over and above current requirements, be provided by such development?	No, development should not be granted increased in density or height	50%	41%		-9%
	Yes, development should be granted increases in density or height, but ONLY IF additional community benefits are provide	38%	44%		6%
	Yes, development should be granted increases in height or density, without any additional community benefit provided	8%	11%		3%
	Don't know/not sure	4%	5%		1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	514	514		

28 Dec 16
Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results











COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM DEVELOPMENT Please rank up to five options that you believe should be tied to approving increases in development potential on a site.		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
First rank	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	32%	34%	 2%
	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	12%	11%	 -2%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	10%	13%	 3%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	11%	11%	 -1%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	14%	7%	 -7%
	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	6%	9%	 3%
	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	3%	6%	 4%
	Increased job/revenue generation	4%	4%	 0%
	Other benefits potential on a site	4%	2%	 -2%
	Economic vitality opportunity	3%	2%	 -2%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	1%	1%	 0%
	TOTAL	100%	100%	
Second rank	n =	221	221	
	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	14%	21%	 6%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	16%	18%	 2%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	14%	12%	 -1%
	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	10%	11%	 0%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	9%	10%	 1%
	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	11%	7%	 -4%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	7%	6%	 -1%
	Increased job/revenue generation	6%	3%	 -3%
	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	6%	3%	 -3%
	Economic vitality opportunity	4%	4%	 1%
	Other benefits potential on a site	2%	4%	 2%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
	n =	210	210	












Third rank	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	11%	15%		3%
	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	17%	9%		-8%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	10%	14%		4%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	11%	11%		0%
	Economic vitality opportunity	9%	11%		3%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	12%	7%		-6%
	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	8%	9%		1%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	7%	7%		0%
	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	7%	7%		-1%
	Increased job/revenue generation	5%	6%		2%
	Other benefits potential on a site	3%	4%		1%
	TOTAL	100%	100%		
	n =	195	195		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016 Final Results

COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM DEVELOPMENT Please rank up to five options that you believe should be tied to approving increases in development potential on a site.		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Fourth rank	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	15%	13%		-1%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	13%	14%		0%
	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	11%	15%		3%
	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	11%	15%		4%
	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	11%	9%		-2%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	11%	9%		-3%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	11%	8%		-3%
	Economic vitality opportunity	6%	9%		2%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	6%	4%		-2%
	Increased job/revenue generation	4%	5%		1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	157	157		

Fifth rank	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	19%	16%		-4%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	8%	15%		6%
	Increased job/revenue generation	11%	11%		0%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	8%	13%		4%
	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	12%	8%		-4%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	6%	11%		5%
	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	10%	8%		-2%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	10%	7%		-3%
	Economic vitality opportunity	5%	6%		1%
	Other benefits potential on a site	5%	3%		-2%
	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	5%	2%		-2%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	108	108		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016 Final Results

COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM DEVELOPMENT Please rank up to five options that you believe should be tied to approving increases in development potential on a site.		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Top three community benefits combined	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	52%	61%	<div></div>	9%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	34%	41%	<div></div>	7%
	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	38%	26%	<div></div>	-12%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	29%	34%	<div></div>	5%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	38%	25%	<div></div>	-12%
	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	23%	30%	<div></div>	8%
	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	19%	21%	<div></div>	2%
	Economic vitality opportunity	14%	17%	<div></div>	2%
	Increased job/revenue generation	14%	13%	<div></div>	-1%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	14%	12%	<div></div>	-1%
	Other benefits potential on a site	9%	10%	<div></div>	1%
TOTAL		283%	291%		
	n =	221	221		

Top five community benefits combined	Additional permanently affordable housing for low and middle income households	66%	77%	11%
	Energy efficiency improvements beyond what is required	47%	51%	4%
	Additional accessible and useable open spaces	43%	51%	9%
	The development is close to a high-frequency transit corridor	50%	40%	-9%
	Neighborhood-serving retail and services	51%	38%	-13%
	Non-profit space or affordable commercial space	36%	46%	10%
	Cultural and art facilities, such as venue and performance spaces, community public art and murals	37%	37%	0%
	Economic vitality opportunity	21%	27%	5%
	Increased job/revenue generation	22%	24%	1%
	Financial contribution to a community benefit fund	21%	22%	1%
	Other benefits potential on a site	11%	11%	0%
TOTAL		403%	423%	
	n =	221	221	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

DEMOGRAPHICS		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
Do you live in:	City of Boulder	85%	89%	4%
	Unincorporated area of Boulder County	15%	11%	-3%
	Other area outside the Boulder Valley	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
	n =	510	510	
About how many years have you lived in the Boulder Valley?	Less than a year	1%	3%	2%
	1	1%	1%	0%
	2-4	7%	20%	13%
	5-9	11%	18%	8%
	10-19	25%	23%	-2%
	20-29	24%	18%	-7%
	30-39	14%	7%	-7%
	40 or more	18%	10%	-8%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		23.6	16.2	
n =		509	509	
Including yourself, how many people live in your household?	1	18%	17%	-1%
	2	44%	46%	2%
	3	16%	14%	-3%
	4	18%	19%	1%
	5	3%	3%	0%
	6	1%	2%	1%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		2.5	2.5	
n =		513	513	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates












BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

DEMOGRAPHICS		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Are you employed?	Yes	77%	84%		7%
	No	23%	16%		-7%
TOTAL		100%	100%		0%
	n =	515	515		
(If employed) Where do you work?	Boulder	74%	77%		3%
	Other	9%	9%		0%
	Denver	5%	4%		-1%
	Longmont	4%	5%		1%
	Broomfield/Interlocken	3%	2%		-1%
	Louisville	3%	1%		-1%
	Jefferson County	1%	1%		0%
	Lafayette	1%	0%		0%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	398	398		
(If employed) Do you ever work at your home?	No	34%	36%		2%
	Yes, my business is out of my home	17%	11%		-6%
	Yes, I always work at home instead of my employer's location	5%	5%		-1%
	Yes, sometimes I work at home instead of my employer's location, sometimes at my employer's location	40%	42%		3%
	Other	5%	6%		
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	396	396		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

DEMOGRAPHICS		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted	
Are you a full- or part-time university or college student?	No	96%	84%		-12%
	Yes, at the CU Boulder campus	3%	14%		11%
	Yes, somewhere else	1%	2%		1%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	514	514		
Which most closely describes the type of housing unit you live in?	A single-family home	75%	56%		-18%
	A condominium or townhouse	19%	26%		7%
	An apartment in an apartment complex	5%	15%		10%
	An apartment in a single-family home	0%	2%		2%
	A mobile home	1%	0%		-1%
	Other	0%	0%		0%
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	513	513		
Do you own or rent your residence? (If you own a mobile home but pay a lot fee, then you own your residence)	Own	87%	53%		-34%
	Rent	12%	46%		34%
	Other	1%	1%		
TOTAL		100%	100%		
	n =	507	507		

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

DEMOGRAPHICS		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
What is your age?	20 to 24	1%	6%	5%
	25 to 34	9%	38%	30%
	35 to 44	17%	15%	-1%
	45 to 54	23%	14%	-8%
	55 to 64	30%	14%	-16%
	65 to 74	20%	12%	-8%
	Over 74	1%	1%	-1%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
Average		53.6	43.0	
Median		60.0	40.0	
n =		509	509	
Do any of the following live in your household?	Children age 12 or younger	20%	18%	-1%
	Teenagers age 13 to 18	11%	6%	-5%
	Adults age 65 or older	21%	12%	-9%
	Anyone with a long-term disability	6%	8%	2%
	None of the above	49%	61%	12%
TOTAL		107%	106%	
n =		502	502	
Which of these categories best describes the total gross annual income of your household (before taxes)?	Less than \$50,000	14%	20%	6%
	\$50,000 to \$99,999	24%	30%	7%
	\$100,000 to \$149,999	23%	19%	-5%
	\$150,000 to \$199,999	18%	14%	-4%
	\$200,000 to \$249,999	9%	10%	1%
	\$250,000 or more	13%	8%	-5%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
n =		471	471	
Are you of Chicano/Chicana/Mexican-American, Latino/Latina, or Hispanic origin?	Yes	4%	6%	3%
	No	96%	94%	-3%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
n =		500	500	

28 Dec 16

Source: RRC Associates

BOULDER VALLEY COMP PLAN SURVEY 2016
Final Results

DEMOGRAPHICS		Unweighted Results	Weighted Results	Weighted vs Unweighted
Which best describes your race?	White	95%	95%	1%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	4%	4%	0%
	Other	3%	3%	0%
	Black or African American	1%	0%	0%
	American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut	1%	0%	0%
TOTAL		103%	103%	
	n =	492	492	
What is your gender?	Male	50%	50%	0%
	Female	50%	50%	0%
	Other	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL		100%	100%	
	n =	500	500	
Would you be interested in	Yes, participate in additional surveys/focus groups	67%	75%	7%
	Yes, be signed up for the City of Boulder Planning Department email list	41%	41%	1%
	Yes, enter the prize drawing	62%	74%	12%
	No	17%	11%	-5%
TOTAL		187%	201%	
	n =	506	506	

28 Dec 16
Source: RRC Associates